Case 1:15-cv-02697-KPF Document 14 Filed 08/13/15 Page 1 of 16 1

F7F3GAMC 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----x 2 3 ISRAEL GAMERO, 4 Plaintiff, 5 15 CV 2697 (KPF) V. 6 KOODO SUSHI CORP., et al., 7 Defendants. 8 New York, N.Y. 9 July 15, 2015 4:00 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. KATHERINE POLK FAILLA, 12 District Judge 13 APPEARANCES 14 MICHAEL FAILLACE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 15 Attorneys for Plaintiff BY: SHAWN CLARK 16 MICHELLE KOO 17 Pro Se Defendant 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 THE DEPUTY CLERK: In the matter of Israel Gamero, et 2 al. v. Koodo Sushi, et al. If counsel and parties could say 3 their names for the record. 4 MR. CLARK: Shawn Clark from Michael Faillace & 5 Associates for the plaintiffs. Good afternoon. THE COURT: Good afternoon. Is Ms. Gutierrez not 6 7 interested in showing up? 8 MR. CLARK: I apologize. Ms. Gutierrez is on 9 vacation, so I filed an appearance earlier today. 10 THE COURT: It hasn't made its way to me. 11 fine. 12 Hi, Ms. Koo. 13 MS. KOO: Good afternoon. I'm sorry. I don't know 14 what the procedure how to do it. My name is Michelle Koo. 15 THE COURT: Ms. Koo, let me ask you the easy question. How do you pronounce the name of your business? 16 17 MS. KOO: Koodo Sushi. 18 THE COURT: There is a Mr. Koo perhaps, a Raymond Koo? 19 MS. KOO: Raymond Koo was my brother. When we formed 20 the corporation was in 2002, and you needed someone to sign the 21 paper as a witness or someone. So he put his name to help me

THE COURT: It is your company and your company alone.

do it. He has nothing to do with us. And I have from day one

the corporation tax return. There is nothing with him. He has

22

23

24

25

no interest in this issue.

1	MS. KOO: My company alone, yes.
2	THE COURT: Okay.
3	MS. KOO: 2009 when I divorced, it is on my own.
4	Before, it was me and my husband.
5	THE COURT: So, 2002 when the company was formed
6	MS. KOO: Is formed, yes.
7	THE COURT: That was your brother assisting you or
8	being a signatory?
9	MS. KOO: A secretary or something. I don't know what
10	is that.
11	THE COURT: He was a secretary of the company?
12	MS. KOO: Yes, he signed it because they needed two
13	people or some people to sign, so he helped to sign it.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Your husband was not involved in
15	2002?
16	MS. KOO: No. It is only me. But when time we
17	divorced and the whole company belongs to me, because he took
18	everything else. I took the company.
19	THE COURT: Thank you very much. I'll ask a couple of
20	questions of Mr. Clark right now.
21	MS. KOO: Sure. May I sit down?
22	THE COURT: Yes, please. It is easier if you're
23	speaking to me, I'll ask you to stand so I can see you and hear
24	you, otherwise you can sit down.

MS. KOO: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Clark, have you or Ms. Gutierrez been in contact with Ms. Koo since she appeared in this case?

MR. CLARK: Yes, we have. I did also have a conversation with Ms. Koo prior to this conference about some of the issues, including Mr. Raymond Koo. I understand that both him and of course the defendant, defendant corporation are in default presently. Given her representation concerning Mr. Raymond Koo, I am inclined to dismiss him. I would need to confer with my clients in order to simply substantiate what I'm being told here. I do think one of the motivating factors behind naming him in this action is that the New York State Department of State filings for the corporation do include him being referenced I believe several times.

THE COURT: Yes. Perhaps for the reasons she has suggested to us.

MR. CLARK: Exactly. I do want to try to verify that as best I can. Otherwise I'm inclined to dismiss him from the case as long as all of that proves true.

THE COURT: We have a different issue, sir, and you know what it is because you are about to hint at it. That is that the corporation itself cannot be represented by Ms. Koo. The corporation can't go pro se and it needs a lawyer. Yet it might be counterproductive to pursue default judgment proceedings against the corporation when its principal is right here, seeming to be interested in resolving or at least

addressing this litigation.

Do you agree?

MR. CLARK: I agree completely. I did speak prior to this conference with Ms. Koo. I served her with our initial disclosures and some beginning discovery requests.

But after talking with her and understanding it may not be helpful to be sending legally worded interrogatories and document demands, I said it may be helpful just to have some informal discovery of what documents do exist in the case. And I also asked if there were any voluntarily financial disclosures she would like to make. She made many references to the fact this is a situation where her business does not have substantial assets.

THE COURT: By "substantial assets," do you mean assets sufficient to meet the threshold?

MR. CLARK: Well, assets sufficient to pay the potential judgment in this action.

This is a case where, from my conversations with her, I don't believe there is any real dispute that at least two of the three plaintiffs were paid at a salary rate without any real attempt to pay them hourly at all. Often the salary calculations in these kinds of cases lead to very substantial damages. We did serve a damages calculation on the defendants, and I know she is very distressed about that, given the amount of potential liability in the case. And we did have

conversations about the financial status of her business.

I thus asked her to provide some sort of financial documentation, if she can, in advance of a settlement conference. I did try to explain what the settlement conference may look like before a magistrate. And then see if we can reach some sort of amicable resolution before we really rely on any formal discovery mechanisms or like.

THE COURT: All right. I understand what you are saying and I am going to talk to her in a moment about this. A related question for me is this: We are at a very early stage of the litigation. It is usually at this initial conference that you and I talk about whether it is appropriate to seek conditional certification of a collective action, and whether the discovery protocols in the case should reflect time for a motion or a stipulation. I don't know, based on your knowledge of the financial situation or your ever growing knowledge of the financial situation of the defendants, whether we wish to engage in motion practice.

MR. CLARK: I don't think that's necessary, your

Honor. I think the best chance for the best possible recovery

for the individuals who are in this action is to proceed as

individuals.

THE COURT: Okay. Then, should we consider -- I'll talk to Ms. Koo about this in a moment -- endorsing the case management plan that you have provided for me, explaining to

Ms. Koo what that means, and what a settlement conference can often result in or how it would progress, and what would happen if it fails?

MR. CLARK: Yes. I think that sounds perfect, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Koo, you're welcome to sit down as well. Let me talk to you just what we were talking about. There are a couple of things at issue in this case that I would like to explain to you. In so doing, I'm not attempting to provide you legal advice. I'm simply telling you things that come up at conferences of this type.

You are of course able to proceed pro se without the assistance of an attorney and you are doing that right now.

The law is such that a company may not do that. So, Koodo

Sushi may not be represented by you, and somebody has to speak on its behalf.

That said, at this time there doesn't seem to be a reason to suggest that Koodo is in default of its obligations in this lawsuit, because here you are trying to resolve the matter on your behalf and on its behalf. So for the moment, at least, we'll put Koodo to the side for a moment.

The other thing we were talking about is this case, when it was initially filed, had within it a suggestion that the plaintiffs might wish to add other parties, other delivery

persons. And sometimes that is done by motion practice where the plaintiff asks me to define a class in a certain manner, and sometimes it is done by the parties' agreement as to who is within the class.

In this case, what Mr. Clark and I were just talking about is that there are several named plaintiffs in the case, and it might be best for them and for this case if we keep the group that now exists and not have motion practice that might be costly and might be complicating for other reasons. So, what we're going to do for now is this case will proceed with these two plaintiffs, three plaintiffs, excuse me, no.

Mr. Gamero and Mr. Sanchez, is that correct?

MR. CLARK: No, there's three, your Honor.

Mr. Gamero, Mr. Mastranzo, and Mr. Sanchez.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. So there are these three plaintiffs. And if there is not going to be discussion about this motion practice regarding expanding the class of plaintiffs, what happens next in cases of this type is discovery.

Now, am I correct have you filed an answer, Ms. Koo?
MS. KOO: Yes.

THE COURT: That's what I thought. So discovery is the period of time in a case where the parties exchange the information that each side believes is relevant to its claims or to its defenses. In cases of this type, what typically

F7F3GAMC

happens is that companies like yours are asked for records that they may have of their employees, their schedules, their payments, how they were paid, if there are electronic or paper documents evidencing that. Sometimes folks are asked questions about the notices that they provide to their employees about their rights under certain statutes, things of that nature. And especially in cases of this type, it can be helpful, I'm not saying it is necessary, but it can be helpful to exchange certain documents early on so that both parties really get a sense of just how much substance there are to these claims and how much it will cost to litigate them.

MS. KOO: Okay.

THE COURT: So, I will give you a period of approximately 120 days to get this all done. I am suggesting to you that you may find it useful to get your materials together very early and to share them with Mr. Clark and his law firm, and he will share his relevant materials with you all.

The next step would then be to see whether there is a basis to settle the case. Sometimes the parties can settle on their own. Oftentimes in cases of this type, they receive assistance from either a court-appointed mediator or a magistrate judge. And without, again, making the decision for you, I can tell you that you have Judge Netburn as a magistrate judge. She's in this building. She has settled many cases of

mine, and I think she's very good -- they're all very good at what they do, but she is especially good at helping parties determine whether a case can be settled or not.

Unless the parties have an objection, it may make the most sense to refer the case to Judge Netburn in approximately a month, and then you can decide when and if it is fruitful to go before her.

Just a couple of things to keep in mind. When I endorse this schedule, there will be a number of dates in it.

Really, for me, the important date is the end date of discovery, which ends up being in the middle of November. I'm one of those judges who is quite stringent about deadlines.

So, I believe you have enough time to figure out your documents and to exchange them and to talk between yourselves. I would ask you not to ask for extensions, because I won't give them to you.

My hope is that in the next couple of months you can figure out whether this case can settle or not. If not, you'll get the discovery done that you need to get done. If it turns out this case does not settle and discovery concludes without settlement, you'll come before me in November to talk about where we are in the case and what you both would like to do and whether this is a situation that for which a trial would be useful, whether there is something else that can be done.

So, I will set a conference right now for November 24

F7F3GAMC

22

23

24

25

1 at 3:30. Don't worry. I'll be sending you a document with that date in it. 2 MS. KOO: November 24 I won't be here. 3 4 THE COURT: Where will you be? 5 MS. KOO: I will be in China. THE COURT: Okay. 6 7 MS. KOO: I'm leaving on November 17. THE COURT: November 17. When will you return? 8 9 MS. KOO: Return December 5. 10 THE COURT: All right. I'll look at our calendar and 11 see if we can get something either before the 17th or after the 12 5th. 13 MS. KOO: Sorry. It is very important. It is my 14 father. We need to have a ceremony and I need to go. 15 THE COURT: I understand that. 16 MS. KOO: Sorry. 17 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Clark, I should ask you, 18 do you have any commitments during that time period that you know of? 19 20 MR. CLARK: No. Nothing other than like the 21

traditional Thanksgiving period.

THE COURT: I'll try not to have something on Thanksqiving. Okay.

So, Mr. Clark, does it make sense to do as I've just suggested, to endorse the case management plan, to set up the

issuance of a referral to Judge Netburn in about 30 days, and to understand you will be speaking with Ms. Koo on a regular basis about the discovery you have and the discovery you need?

MR. CLARK: Yes. Absolutely, your Honor. I think a settlement conference may be the best way of resolving the case.

THE COURT: Should I issue the referral order sooner than 30 days, sir?

MR. CLARK: Some of it depends on what timetable the defendants can produce the documents that we've described. Both the underlying wage documents, and to what degree the voluntary financial documents can be produced as well. This is a case that strikes me, from what I've heard thus far, is really going to be about the defendant's ability to pay rather than a substantial issues around the merits. And accordingly, whatever we can get in order to verify defendant's representations before the settlement conference would be for the best.

THE COURT: Then I will keep the 30-day window that I've suggested. And obviously, if the parties want something sooner, you'll let me know.

Ms. Koo, do you understand what I've been talking about with respect to discovery and with respect to how this case will progress?

MS. KOO: As I understand it, I told this gentleman

already anything he wants I provide to him. I have all detailed information, their signature, everything. The only thing is I told him, like, when I first hire you, I tell you what is your wage, whatever. The first payroll I write down very detail for. But I am working by myself seven days a week. No way for me every single pay I'll write down very clearly. So the first one, definitely very clear. But afterwards it is, especially for two of them, it's the fixed rate. So it is like 450 or 550. I won't detail and break down. There is no way for me to do it. As I explained to him, I said beside this, I have their signature, everything I said.

Thank you so much for letting me have the opportunity to defend myself. Because I call a lawyer, he says \$15,000 for retaining fee. I cannot do it.

THE COURT: I understand.

Let me talk to you about a couple more things. All right. You may have heard us use some terms, and I want to be sure you know what they are. In discovery, the parties ask each other for documents. So you may see "requests for documents," and that means what it says. They are asking you if you have documents that are relevant or that are responsive to certain things. And if you do, you oftentimes have to produce them.

Sometimes you will hear the word "interrogatories."

Interrogatories means questions to you. They tend to be used

to help folks identify who people are, who works at your company, who pays people at your company. It may be in this case that you may have discussions with Mr. Clark or with Ms. Gutierrez that suggest you don't need formal interrogatories, but that's what they are. If you see them, that's what they are.

Sometimes there may be depositions. You may have heard that term. I will tell you what it is. A deposition is the questioning of someone under oath. You meet in an office, there is a court reporter, just as we have here, taking down the proceedings, and you are placed under oath. And someone such as Mr. Clark will ask you questions about the case. You have the ability to depose people yourself. But if you hear someone refer to a deposition, that's what we're talking about.

Mr. Clark is aware, as I am aware, that you have some financial issues that are occurring right now and he may make a decision and you may make a decision that deposition testimony is just not necessary in this case.

At the front end what seems to be the most necessary is for you and he to talk about your documents and to see whether they could answer the questions that he and his clients have. All right?

MS. KOO: Sure. One question. Documentation. I have the whole thing. I give to him or give him copy or how this work?

THE COURT: Ah.

MS. KOO: Our pay, right, in one day we have five people together. Everyone have a printout thing, they have their signature, we all attach together. Everything in an envelope. It is this much. So do I need to give all original to him or how this working?

THE COURT: You and he will talk about this. If you give him the original, the concern is you want to have a set for yourself. So it does make the most sense to give him a copy. If it is electronic, it is much easier than you standing by a photocopier and copying things. You want to have a record of what you've given to him, so you probably want to keep a set for yourself.

MS. KOO: Thank you.

THE COURT: Do you have any other questions?

MS. KOO: That's all. Thank you so much.

THE COURT: Certainly.

So I will endorse this case management plan. I will send it to you both. In 30 days we'll get the referral order. We'll find a post-discovery conference that is not when Ms. Koo is away, and Mr. Clark, I am going to ask you please to get a copy of this transcript for today's proceeding, and when you receive it, and you can receive it just in the ordinary course, please send a copy to Ms. Koo so she has a record of what happened here today.

1	MR. CLARK: Yes, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: Do you have anything that you want to
3	raise with me today?
4	MR. CLARK: Nothing from plaintiffs, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Thank you both for coming in this
6	afternoon.
7	MS. KOO: Thank you so much.
8	000
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	